REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending. Claims 1, 18, 32, and 33, which are independent claims, have been amended in this response. Claims 1, 18, and 33 have been amended to correct minor typographical errors. Support for the amendments to claim 32 are found throughout the specification, for example, in paragraphs [0065]-[0067], and FIG. 10. No new matter has been introduced.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4-7, 10-13, 18-25, and 28-34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Murakami (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0128291) in view of Koyanagi (U.S. Patent No. 6,720,987) in view of Monroe (U.S. Patent 6,970,183). Claims 2, 8, and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Murakami in view of Koyanagi, Monroe, and Lin (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0058340. Claims 3, 14-17, 26, and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Murakami, Koyanagi, Monroe, and Murching (U.S. Patent No. 6,917,692. Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections for the following reasons.

With respect to claim 1, the Office concedes that neither Murakami nor Koyanagi discloses a second processing module that detects and tracks a person's head in the rectilinear video images, and extracts video images in the person's view from the rectilinear video images, as recited in claim 1. The Office relies upon Monroe to teach this feature. For the following reasons, Monroe does not remedy the failures of Murakami or Koyanagi.

Murakami discloses a video surveillance system that automatically keeps track of a moving object in an accurate and efficient manner. Koyanagi discloses a controller for photographing apparatus and a photographing system. *See Koyanagi*, Title. In this regard, Koyanagi states:

> A picture photographed by a camera portion is sent to a video
> capturing portion of a computer. The picture is displayed in an operation
> area of a monitor. A panorama picture of which pictures in part or all

Applicant : Mohan M. Trivedi et al.   Attorney's Docket No.: 15670-0045US1 / SD2002-
Serial No.: 10/519,818   141
Filed : February 15, 2006
Page : 9 of 13

moving range of a pan tiler are combined is displayed in a panorama operation area. A pan tilter portion sends positional information of pan and tilt to the computer through a mode controller. With a mouse, the operation area and the panorama operation area are operated so as to select an object. The computer obtains data for driving the pan tilter. Thus, the selected object is displayed at the center of the operation area.

Id., Abstract.

Monroe discloses a comprehensive, wireless multimedia surveillance and monitoring system that provides a combination of megapixel digital camera capability with full motion video surveillance with a network, including network components and appliances such as wiring, workstations, and servers with the option of geographical distribution with various wide area carriers. *See Monroe*, Abstract.

The Office asserts that Monroe indicates the capability of comparing face pictures with stored data for identification purposes in addition to tracking capabilities. Thus, the Office equates Monroe's capability of comparing face pictures with stored data for identification purposes to "to detect and track a person's head in the rectilinear video images and to extract video images in the person's view from the rectilinear video images." *See Office Action*, page 3, 2nd paragraph. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In support of its assertion, the Office Action cites portions of Monroe (*see Monroe*, col. 23, lines 1-11) which states:

> Auxiliary contacts 739 are supplied for control of external devices, such as an electric strike to unlock a door. The auxiliary contacts may then be operated in conjunction with a keypad, or the keypad and the server, thus providing access control, whereby <u>an image of the person attempting or completing access may be collected</u>. The camera may also be used for <u>visual evaluation of the person desiring access prior to access and/or the person's identification</u>. This can be done with human assistance or with computer image processing and facial recognition. Other biometric sensors may also be configured.

Id.

Thus, Monroe describes collecting an image of a person and visually evaluating the person and the person's identification. The cited portion of Monroe does not describe or suggest detecting a person's head and <u>tracking</u> the person's head <u>in the rectilinear video images</u>, as recited in claim 1. Whereas Monroe discloses evaluating

and identifying a person in an image, Monroe does not describe or suggest tracking the person's head in the image. Further, the cited portion of Monroe does not describe or suggest extracting video images from the rectilinear video image that are in the person's view, as recited in claim 1.

Further, in support of its assertion, the Office cites portions of Monroe (*see Monroe*, col. 28, lines 62 – col. 29, line 2) which state:

> A wide angle or the tilt feature may be used to view the environment to determine surrounding activity such as the presence of a second person in the room. The range finder 566 permits the tracking system to locate objects in a precise manner and then provide control signals to permit accurate surveillance and monitoring of same, such as zooming the camera or positioning of other sensor elements.

Id.

The cited portions of Monroe do not disclose detecting and tracking a person's head in the rectilinear video images and extracting video images in the person's view from the rectilinear video images. Although Monroe does disclose a tracking camera network appliance (*see id.*, col. 26, line 66 – col. 27, line 10, FIG. 40), Monroe's tracking camera network appliance is merely a camera that is adapted to respond to several different types of control signals by permitting locating objects in a precise manner. *See id.* For these reasons, Monroe does not describe or suggest "to detect and track a person's head in the rectilinear video images and to extract video images in the person's view from the rectilinear video images," as recited in claim 1. Lin does not remedy the failures of Murakami or Monroe or Koyanagi. Accordingly, applicants submit that the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims should be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 18, neither Murakami, Monroe, Koyanagi, nor any proper combination of the three describes or suggests "a video transmission mechanism to deliver said video stream to a plurality of video receivers, said video transmission mechanism comprising a video server which filters information in said video stream according to security levels assigned to video receivers to produce different filtered video streams to different video receivers," as recited in claim 18. The Office concedes that Murakami does not disclose this feature recited in claim 18. *See Office Action,*

Applicant : Mohan M. Trivedi et al.
Serial No. : 10/519,818
Filed : February 15, 2006
Page : 11 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 15670-0045US1 / SD2002-141

page 7, 2nd paragraph, and relies upon Monroe to teach this feature. For the following reasons, Monroe does not remedy the failures of Murakami.

In support of the assertion that Monroe teaches this feature recited in claim 18, the Office Action cites portions of Monroe (*see Monroe*, col. 30, lines 41-54) which state:

> Primary parties and secondary or backup parties may be identified. Time frames can be assigned. For example, perhaps three individuals are "on call" during one day and the notification is assigned based upon the time of day. A second method is to interface the time accounting system to see who is "clocked in" at a particular time. That individual would automatically be the priority contact during the period of time he is clocked in. GPS tracking of personnel can also be used to notify the closest personnel, the closest monitor and to track and route the event and the event response. For example, personnel can be directed to the event using GPS signal monitoring and management to identify both the precise location of the event and the closest response personnel.

Id.

Thus, Monroe describes identifies primary and secondary parties that Monroe's multimedia surveillance system can contact based on an on call status. The Office Action equates the identification of parties in Monroe to the filtering of information in a video stream according to security levels. *See Office Action*, page 7, 2nd paragraph. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As recited in claim 18, a video transmission mechanism delivers a video stream to a multiple video receivers. The video transmission mechanism includes a video server which <u>filters information in the video stream according to security levels assigned to video receivers</u> to produce different filtered video streams to different video receivers. Neither the cited portion nor any other portion of Monroe describe or suggest filtering information in a video stream according to security levels assigned to video receivers. For these reasons, Monroe does not describe or suggest "a video transmission mechanism to deliver said video stream to a plurality of video receivers, said video transmission mechanism comprising a video server which filters information in said video stream according to security levels assigned to video receivers to produce different filtered video streams to different video receivers," as recited in claim 18.

Koyanagi does not remedy the failures of either Murakami or Monroe. Further, neither Lin nor Murching remedy the failures of Murakami or Monroe or Koyanagi. Accordingly, applicants submit that the rejection of claim 18 and its dependents should be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 32, as amended, the claim recites, in part, "a second processing module to extract a face from the streaming rectilinear video images, to perform face recognition on the extracted face, and to generate images viewed by the face based on estimating an orientation of the face in the rectilinear video images." (Emphasis added). Neither Murakami, Monroe, Koyanagi, nor any proper combination of the three describes or suggests these features recited in amended claim 32, at least for reasons similar to claim 1. Accordingly, applicants submit that the rejection of claim 32 should be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 33, the claim recites, in part, "wherein said digital processor includes a user graphic interface with pan, tilt, and zoom adjustments to allow for customized viewing of the scene, and said digital processor is operable to superimpose a customized video of the scene over a digital image." (Emphasis added). Neither Murakami, Monroe, Koyanagi, nor any proper combination of the three describes or suggests these features recited in claim 33. The Office Action purports to reject claim 33 for reasons similar to claim 18. See Office Action, page 12, 3rd paragraph. However, with respect to claim 18, the Office does not assert that any of the references describe or suggest a digital processor that is operable to superimpose a customized video of the scene over a digital image. Further, neither Murakami, Monroe, or Koyanagi describe or suggest a digital processor that is operable to superimpose a customized video of the scene over a digital image, as recited in claim 33. Accordingly, applicants submit that the rejection of claim 33 and its dependent claim should be withdrawn.

For the aforementioned reasons, applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicant : Mohan M. Trivedi et al.
Serial No. : 10/519,818
Filed : February 15, 2006
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 15670-0045US1 / SD2002-141

CONCLUSION

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

The required PTO Fee $555.00 for a three month extension of time is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization.

Please apply any additional charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 10, 2010

Sushil Shrinivasan
Reg. No. L0368

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer No.: 20985

Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

10960450.doc